



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,208	12/15/2003	Steve Pollack	NC 84,693	1817
26384	7590	11/17/2005	EXAMINER	
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY			CAMERON, ERMA C	
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS)			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CODE 1008.2			1762	
4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W.				
WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5320			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/735,208	POLLACK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Erma Cameron	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,9 and 13-32 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,5,9,13 and 31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,6,14-30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. The examiner considers that Claims 2, 5, 9, 13 and 31, which had “withdrawn” status as of the 9/26/2005 after final amendment, continue to have “withdrawn” status.  
Claims 1, 6, 14-30 and 32 have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
3. Claims 1, 6, 14-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

2-butanol in [0022] has a Bp of 99.5 degrees C and does not meet applicant's claim of solvents with a Bp in excess of 120 C.

See attached printout from Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary.

4. The rejection of Claims 1, 6, 14-18, 22-23 and 27-30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a process to make a conductive coating, does not reasonably provide enablement for any coating, is withdrawn because of the amendment of 10/19/2005

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a) Claim 24: it is not clear if the monomer actually polymerizes into a conductive polymer or is merely capable of it.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 6, 14-16, 19-20, 22-25, 27-28, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al (6867281).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

'281 teaches reacting derivatives of 3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene, an oxidant such as iron toluenesulfonate and a base such as imidazole in a solvent such as 2-methoxyethanol (Bp-125 C) into highly conductive and transparent polymeric films. The conductivity is as high as 600 S/cm and the transparency is as high as 88%. The reactants are spun coated up to 8000 RPM. The coated substrate is heated to produce the polymer. The base to monomer ratio is 2:1. Example 4 shows the solids content to be 42%. (3:54-62; 4:66-5:6; see Examples 3-4 and Table 1). The iron oxidant and imidazole would inherently form a complex.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 17-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al (6867281).

‘281 is applied here for the reasons given above

The oxidant to monomer ratio is 2.6 to 1.5:1, which overlaps with applicant’s claimed range.

‘281 does not teach a conductivity of 750 S/cm as in claim 21, but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have optimized the conductivity of the polymeric film, as this is known to be a valuable characteristic of conductive films.

11. Claims 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al (6867281) taken in view of Angelopoulos et al (6153725).

‘281 is applied here for the reasons given above.

‘281 fails to teach the unsubstituted ethylene dioxythiophene of claim 26 or the tertiary amine of claim 29 as base.

‘725 teaches the use of polythiophenes in making conductive polymers (4:60-67), as well as DMF, a tertiary amine (7:20-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the polythiophenes and DMF of ‘725 for the fluorinated thiophene and imidazole of ‘281 with the reasoned expectation of equivalent results.

*Conclusion*

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erma Cameron whose telephone number is 571-272-1416. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**ERMA CAMERON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Erma Cameron  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1762

November 14, 2005